

Parallel extragradient - viscosity methods for equilibrium problems and fixed point problems

Dang Van Hieu

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this paper, we propose two parallel extragradient - viscosity methods for finding a particular element in the common solution set of a system of equilibrium problems and finitely many fixed point problems. This particular point is the unique solution of a variational inequality problem on the common solution set. The main idea of the paper is to combine three methods including the extragradient method, the Mann iteration method, the hybrid steepest-descent method with the parallel splitting-up technique to design the algorithms which improve the performance over some existing methods. The strongly convergent theorems are established under the widely used assumptions for equilibrium bifunctions.

Keywords Equilibrium problem, Fixed point problem, Extragradient method, Hybrid method, Parallel computation

1 Introduction

Let C be a nonempty closed convex subset of a real Hilbert space H . Let $f : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bifunction. The equilibrium problem (EP) for f on C is to find $x^* \in C$ such that

$$f(x^*, y) \geq 0, \forall y \in C. \quad (1)$$

The solution set of EP (1) is denoted by $EP(f, C)$. Mathematically, EP is a generalization of many mathematical models including variational inequality problems (VIP), optimization problems and fixed point problems (FPP), nonlinear and linear complementarity problems, vector minimization problems and Nash equilibria problems, see for instance [5, 9, 16, 17]. Due to this reason, EP has been received a lot of attention by many authors. Some notable methods for studying and solving EPs are the proximal point method [16, 24], the splitting proximal method [22], the extragradient method and the Armijo linesearch method [23], the gradient-like projection method [15], the hybrid extragradient method [1, 10], the extragradient - viscosity method [25].

Dang Van Hieu
Department of Mathematics, Vietnam National University,
334 Nguyen Trai, Thanh Xuan, Hanoi, Vietnam
E-mail: dv.hieu83@gmail.com

Let $S : C \rightarrow C$ be a mapping. Let us denote $\text{Fix}(S)$ by the fixed point set of S , i.e., $\text{Fix}(S) = \{x \in C : x = S(x)\}$. The problem of finding a common element of the fixed point set of a mapping and the solution set of an equilibrium problem is a task arising in various fields of applicable mathematics, sciences, engineering and economy, for example [9]. In [10], the authors presented a model which comes from Nash-Cournot model [9] for finding a point in the solution set $EP(f, C) \cap \text{Fix}(S)$. As a further extension, in this paper we consider the following common solution problem.

Problem 1 Find an element $x^* \in \Omega := (\cap_{i \in I} EP(f_i, C)) \cap (\cap_{j \in J} \text{Fix}(S_j))$, where $f_i : C \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i \in I = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ are bifunctions and $S_j : C \rightarrow C$, $j \in J = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ are mappings.

In recent years, the problem of finding a common solution of EPs and/or VIPs and FPPs has been widely and intensively studied by many authors, for example [6, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 10, 12, 14]. Problem 1 includes many previously considered problems. When $S_j = I$ for all j , Problem 1 becomes the problem of finding a common solution to EPs which was introduced and studied by Combettes and Hirstoaga in [6]. Using the resolvent of a bifunction, the authors proposed a general block-iterative algorithm for finding a common solution of EPs. A special case of this problem is the common solutions to variational inequalities problem (CSVIP) mentioned and analyzed intensively in [8] where the authors proposed an algorithm for CSVIP which combines the extragradient method [18] with the hybrid (outer approximation) method. In a very recent work [10], Problem 1 has been studied and analyzed in the case $M, N > 1$, the authors in [10] proposed some parallel hybrid extragradient methods which combine the extended extragradient method [23], the Mann or Halpern iterations, the parallel splitting-up technique [11] and the outer approximation method (hybrid method). A notable problem in these algorithms is that at each iteration we must construct two closed convex subsets C_n, Q_n of the feasible set C and compute the next approximation being the projection of the starting point x_0 on the intersection $C_n \cap Q_n$. These can be costly and affect the efficiency of the used method.

On the other hand, for finding a particular solution of Problem 1 when $M = N = 1$, Maingé and Moudafi [21] introduced the variational inequality problem: Find $x^* \in EP(f, C) \cap \text{Fix}(S)$ such that

$$\langle F(x^*), y - x^* \rangle \geq 0, \forall y \in EP(f, C) \cap \text{Fix}(S), \quad (2)$$

where $F : C \rightarrow H$ is η - strongly monotone and L - Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there two positive constants η and L such that, for all $x, y \in C$,

$$\langle F(x) - F(y), x - y \rangle \geq \eta \|x - y\|^2,$$

$$\|F(x) - F(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\|.$$

Using the proximal point method for EP and the hybrid steepest - descent method introduced by Yamada and Ogura in [26], Maingé and Moudafi [21] proposed the following iterative method for VIP (2): Choose $x_0 \in C$ and

$$\begin{cases} z_n \in C \text{ such that } f(z_n, y) + \frac{1}{r_n} \langle y - z_n, z_n - x_n \rangle \geq 0, \forall y \in C, \\ x_{n+1} = (1 - w)t_n + wSt_n \text{ with } t_n = z_n - \alpha_n Fz_n, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where w, r_n, α_n are suitable parameters. Recently, with the same idea, Vuong et al. [25] have replaced the proximal point method by the extragradient method [1, 23] for computing z_n in

(3) and proposed the following extragradient - viscosity method for VIP (2): Choose $x_0 \in C$ and

$$\begin{cases} y_n = \operatorname{argmin}\{\rho f(x_n, y) + \frac{1}{2}\|x_n - y\|^2 : y \in C\}, \\ z_n = \operatorname{argmin}\{\rho f(y_n, y) + \frac{1}{2}\|x_n - y\|^2 : y \in C\}, \\ x_{n+1} = (1 - w)t_n + wSt_n \text{ with } t_n = z_n - \alpha_n Fz_n, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where w, ρ, α_n are suitable parameters. The advantage of using the viscosity method is that it gives us strongly convergent algorithms which have more simple and elegant structures.

In this paper, motivated and inspired by the results in [10, 25, 21], we propose two parallel algorithms for Problem 1 which do not require constructing two set C_n, Q_n and computing the projection onto their intersection per each iteration as in [10]. As the idea of Maingé and Moudafi [21], Vuong et al. [25], we also find a particular solution x^* of Problem 1 which satisfies the following variational inequality problem:

$$\langle F(x^*), y - x^* \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \Omega, \quad (5)$$

where $F : C \rightarrow H$ is η - strongly monotone and L - Lipschitz continuous. Let us denote $VIP(F, \Omega)$ by the solution set of VIP (5). Note that if $F(x) = x - u$ with u being a suggested point in H then VIP (5) reduces to the problem of finding an element $x^* \in \Omega$ which is the best approximation of u , i.e., $x^* = P_\Omega(u)$. Firstly, using the extragradient method, we find simultaneously intermediate approximations for each equilibrium problems in the family. After that, among obtained approximations, the furthest one from the previous iterate is chosen. Based on this element, we compute in parallel other intermediate iterates for fixed point problems in this family. Similarly, we defined the next iterate and obtain the first algorithm. Next, as an improvement of finding furthest approximations in the first algorithm, we use convex combinations of component intermediate approximations and propose the second parallel algorithm. In our numerical experiments, with the first way, we see that the obtained algorithm seems to be more effective than the second one and hybrid methods proposed in [10]. Some advantages of this performance in comparing with that of cyclic methods, specially when the numbers of subproblems N, M are large, can be found in [3, 4, 10, 13] and several references therein.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. 2 we recall some definitions and preliminary results for the further use. Sec. 3 deals with proposing the algorithms and proving their convergence. Finally, in Sec. 4 we present a numerical example to illustrate the convergence of our algorithms and compare them with the parallel hybrid method in [10].

2 Preliminaries

Let C be a nonempty closed convex subset of a real Hilbert space H . We begin with some definitions and properties of a demicontractive mapping.

Definition 2.1 A mapping $S : C \rightarrow C$ is called:

- (i) *nonexpansive* if $\|S(x) - S(y)\| \leq \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in C$.
- (ii) *quasi-nonexpansive* if $\operatorname{Fix}(S) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\|S(x) - x^*\| \leq \|x - x^*\|, \quad \forall x^* \in \operatorname{Fix}(S), \quad \forall x \in C.$$

- (iii) β - *demicontractive* if $\operatorname{Fix}(S) \neq \emptyset$, and there exists $\beta \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$\|S(x) - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x - x^*\|^2 + \beta \|x - S(x)\|^2, \quad \forall x^* \in \operatorname{Fix}(S), \quad \forall x \in C.$$

- (iv) *demiclosed at zero* if, for each sequence $\{x_n\} \subset C$, $x_n \rightarrow x$, and $\|S(x_n) - x_n\| \rightarrow 0$ then $S(x) = x$.

From the definitions above, we see that (i) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (iii). It is well-known that each nonexpansive mapping is demiclosed at zero. Problem 1 was considered in [10] for nonexpansive mappings. In this paper, for more flexibility, we consider the mappings S_j , $j \in J$ being demicontractive. We have the following result for a demicontractive mapping.

Lemma 2.1 [20, Remark 4.2] *Assume that $S : C \rightarrow C$ be a β - demicontractive mapping such that $\text{Fix}(S) \neq \emptyset$. Then*

- (i) $S_w = (1 - w)I + wS$ is a quasi-nonexpansive mapping over C for every $w \in [0, 1 - \kappa]$. Furthermore

$$\|S_w x - x^*\| \leq \|x - x^*\|^2 - w(1 - \beta - w)\|Sx - x\|^2, \forall x^* \in \text{Fix}(S), \forall x \in C.$$

- (ii) $\text{Fix}(S)$ is closed and convex.

Next, we present some concepts of the monotonicity of a bifunction.

Definition 2.2 [5] A bifunction $f : C \times C \rightarrow \Re$ is said to be

- (i) *monotone* on C if

$$f(x, y) + f(y, x) \leq 0, \forall x, y \in C;$$

- (ii) *pseudomonotone* on C if

$$f(x, y) \geq 0 \implies f(y, x) \leq 0, \forall x, y \in C;$$

- (iii) *Lipschitz-type continuous* on C if there exist two positive constants c_1, c_2 such that

$$f(x, y) + f(y, z) \geq f(x, z) - c_1\|x - y\|^2 - c_2\|y - z\|^2, \forall x, y, z \in C.$$

We have the following result about the operator F mentioned in Section 1.

Lemma 2.2 (cf. [26, Lemma 3.1]) *Suppose that $F : C \rightarrow H$ is η - strongly monotone and L - Lipschitz continuous operator. By using arbitrarily fixed $\mu \in \left(0, \frac{2\eta}{L^2}\right)$. Define the mapping $G : C \rightarrow H$ by*

$$G^\mu(x) = (I - \mu F)x, x \in C.$$

Then

- (i) G^μ is strictly contractive over C with the contractive constant $\sqrt{1 - \mu(2\eta - \mu L^2)}$.
(ii) For all $v \in (0, \mu)$,

$$\|G^v(y) - x\| \leq \left(1 - \frac{v\tau}{\mu}\right) \|y - x\| + v\|F(x)\|,$$

where $\tau = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \mu(2\eta - \mu L^2)} \in (0, 1)$.

Proof (i) From the definition of G^μ , the η - strong monotonicity and L - Lipschitz continuity of F , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|G^\mu(x) - G^\mu(y)\|^2 &= \|(x-y) - \mu(F(x) - F(y))\|^2 \\ &= \|x-y\|^2 - 2\mu \langle x-y, F(x) - F(y) \rangle + \mu^2 \|F(x) - F(y)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x-y\|^2 - 2\mu\eta \|x-y\|^2 + \mu^2 L \|x-y\|^2 \\ &= (1 - \mu(2\eta - \mu L)) \|x-y\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the desired conclusion. Next, we prove claim (ii) in this lemma. From the definition of G , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|G^v(y) - x\| &= \|(y - vF(y)) - (x - vF(x)) - vF(x)\| \\ &\leq \|(y - vF(y)) - (x - vF(x))\| + v\|F(x)\| \\ &= \left\| \left(1 - \frac{v}{\mu}\right) (y - x) + \frac{v}{\mu} [(y - \mu F(y)) - (x - \mu F(x))] \right\| + v\|F(x)\| \\ &= \left\| \left(1 - \frac{v}{\mu}\right) (y - x) + \frac{v}{\mu} [G^\mu(y) - G^\mu(x)] \right\| + v\|F(x)\| \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{v}{\mu}\right) \|y - x\| + \frac{v}{\mu} \sqrt{1 - \mu(2\eta - \mu L^2)} \|y - x\| + v\|F(x)\| \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{v\tau}{\mu}\right) \|y - x\| + v\|F(x)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.2 is proved.

Finally, we have the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.3 [20, Remark 4.4] *Let $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ be a sequence of non-negative real numbers. Suppose that for any integer m , there exists an integer p such that $p \geq m$ and $\varepsilon_p \leq \varepsilon_{p+1}$. Let n_0 be an integer such that $\varepsilon_{n_0} \leq \varepsilon_{n_0+1}$ and define, for all integer $n \geq n_0$,*

$$\tau(n) = \max \{k \in \mathbb{N} : n_0 \leq k \leq n, \varepsilon_k \leq \varepsilon_{k+1}\}.$$

Then $0 \leq \varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1}$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Furthermore, the sequence $\{\tau(n)\}_{n \geq n_0}$ is non-decreasing and tends to $+\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

3 Main results

In this section, we propose two parallel algorithms for finding a solution of Problem 1 and prove their convergence. The first algorithm is designed as follows.

Algorithm 3.1 Initialization. Choose $x_0 \in C$. The parameters ρ , α_n , β_n^j satisfy Condition 3 below.

Step 1. Find simultaneously approximations y_n^i , $i \in I$,

$$y_n^i = \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \rho f_i(x_n, y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x_n - y\|^2 : y \in C \right\}.$$

Step 2. Find simultaneously approximations z_n^i , $i \in I$,

$$z_n^i = \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \rho f_i(y_n^i, y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x_n - y\|^2 : y \in C \right\}.$$

Step 3. Compute simultaneously approximations u_n^j , $j \in J$,

$$u_n^j = (1 - \beta_n^j)t_n + \beta_n^j S_j t_n,$$

where $t_n = \bar{z}_n - \alpha_n F(\bar{z}_n)$ and $\bar{z}_n = \operatorname{argmax}\{\|z_n^i - x_n\| : i \in I\}$.

Step 4. Pick $x_{n+1} = \operatorname{argmax}\{\|u_n^j - t_n\| : j \in J\}$. Set $n = n + 1$ and go back **Step 1**.

Remark 3.1 The intermediate approximation $\bar{z}_n$ in Step 3 of Algorithm 3.1 is the furthest element from x_n among all ones z_n^i , $i \in I$ and the next iterate x_{n+1} in Step 4 is the furthest element from t_n among all approximations u_n^j , $j \in J$.

Throughout this paper, from the definitions of $\bar{z}_n$ and x_{n+1} in Algorithm 3.1, we denote $i_n \in I$ and $j_n \in J$ by the indices such that $\bar{z}_n = z_n^{i_n}$ and $x_{n+1} = u_n^{j_n}$. For the sake of simplicity, we also write $\bar{y}_n := y_n^{j_n}$. In order to establish the convergence of Algorithm 3.1, we install the following conditions for the bifunctions f_i , the mappings S_j and the control parameters ρ , α_n and β_n .

Condition 1

- A1. f_i is pseudomonotone on C and $f(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in C$;
- A2. f_i is Lipschitz-type continuous on C with the constants c_1, c_2 ;
- A3. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_i(x_n, y) \leq f(x, y)$ for each sequence $\{x_n\}$ converging weakly to x .
- A4. $f_i(x, \cdot)$ is convex and subdifferentiable on C for every fixed $x \in C$.

Condition 2

- B1. S_j is β -demiccontractive on C , where $\beta \in [0, 1)$;
- B2. S_j is demiclosed at zero.

Condition 3

- (i) $0 < \rho < \min\left\{\frac{1}{2c_1}, \frac{1}{2c_2}\right\}$; (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = 0, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n = +\infty$; (iii) $0 < a \leq \beta_n^j < \frac{1-\beta}{2}$.

Hypothesis A2 was introduced by Mastroeni in [19]. It is necessary to imply the convergence of the auxiliary principle method for EPs. If $A : C \rightarrow H$ is a L -Lipschitz continuous operator then the bifunction $f(x, y) = \langle A(x), y - x \rangle$ satisfies hypothesis A2. It is easy to show that if f_i satisfies conditions A1-A4 then $EP(f_i, C)$ is closed and convex (see, for instance [23]). Under Condition 2, from Lemma 2.1, $Fix(S_j)$ is closed and convex. Thus, Ω is also convex and closed. In this paper, we assume that Ω is nonempty. Hence, it follows from the assumptions of the operator F that VIP (5) has the unique solution on Ω , denoted by x^* . We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.4 [1, 23] Suppose that $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n^i\}$, $\{z_n^i\}$ are the sequences defined by Algorithm 3.1. Then

- (i) $\rho(f_i(x_n, y) - f_i(x_n, y_n^i)) \geq \langle y_n^i - x_n, y_n^i - y \rangle, \forall y \in C, \forall i \in I$.
- (ii) $\|z_n^i - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_1)\|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_2)\|y_n^i - z_n^i\|^2, \forall i \in I$.

Lemma 3.5 Suppose that $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n^i\}$, $\{z_n^i\}$ are the sequences defined by Algorithm 3.1. Then, for all $y \in C$,

$$\rho f_i(y_n^i, y) \geq \langle y_n^i - x_n, y_n^i - z_n^i \rangle - c_1 \rho \|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 - c_2 \rho \|z_n^i - y_n^i\|^2 + \langle z_n^i - x_n, z_n^i - y \rangle.$$

Proof Substituting $y = z_n^i \in C$ into inequality (i) of Lemma 3.4, we obtain

$$\rho (f_i(x_n, z_n^i) - f_i(x_n, y_n^i)) \geq \langle y_n^i - x_n, y_n^i - z_n^i \rangle. \quad (6)$$

From the Lipschitz-type continuity of f_i and the relation (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho f_i(y_n^i, z_n^i) &\geq \rho (f_i(x_n, z_n^i) - f_i(x_n, y_n^i)) - c_1 \rho \|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 - c_2 \rho \|z_n^i - y_n^i\|^2 \\ &\geq \langle y_n^i - x_n, y_n^i - z_n^i \rangle - c_1 \rho \|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 - c_2 \rho \|z_n^i - y_n^i\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Similarly to Lemma 3.4(i), from the definition of z_n^i , we obtain

$$\rho (f_i(y_n^i, y) - f_i(y_n^i, z_n^i)) \geq \langle z_n^i - x_n, z_n^i - y \rangle, \forall y \in C.$$

Thus,

$$\rho f_i(y_n^i, y) \geq \rho f_i(y_n^i, z_n^i) + \langle z_n^i - x_n, z_n^i - y \rangle, \forall y \in C. \quad (8)$$

Combining the relations (7) and (8), we obtain

$$\rho f_i(y_n^i, y) \geq \langle y_n^i - x_n, y_n^i - z_n^i \rangle - c_1 \rho \|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 - c_2 \rho \|z_n^i - y_n^i\|^2 + \langle z_n^i - x_n, z_n^i - y \rangle$$

for all $y \in C$. Lemma 3.5 is proved.

Lemma 3.6 Suppose that $\{x_n\}$, $\{\bar{y}_n\}$, $\{\bar{z}_n\}$ are the sequences defined by Algorithm 3.1. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_1) \|\bar{y}_n - x_n\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_2) \|\bar{y}_n - \bar{z}_n\|^2 \\ &\quad - \|x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n\|^2 - 2\alpha_n \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(\bar{z}_n) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof Substituting $i = i_n$ into the second inequality of Lemma 3.4, we obtain

$$\|\bar{z}_n - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_1) \|\bar{y}_n - x_n\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_2) \|\bar{y}_n - \bar{z}_n\|^2. \quad (9)$$

From the definitions of x_{n+1} and $u_n^{j_n}$,

$$\|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2 = \|u_n^{j_n} - t_n\|^2 = (\beta_n^{j_n})^2 \|t_n - S_{j_n} t_n\|^2$$

which implies that

$$\|t_n - S_{j_n} t_n\|^2 = \frac{1}{(\beta_n^{j_n})^2} \|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2. \quad (10)$$

Set $S_{j_n, \beta_n^{j_n}} = (1 - \beta_n^{j_n})I + \beta_n^{j_n} S_{j_n}$. From the definition of x_{n+1} , we have $x_{n+1} = S_{j_n, \beta_n^{j_n}} t_n$. Since S_{j_n} is β -demicontractive, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that $S_{j_n, \beta_n^{j_n}}$ is quasi-nonexpansive and

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 &= \|S_{j_n, \beta_n^{j_n}} t_n - x^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \beta_n^{j_n} (1 - \beta - \beta_n^{j_n}) \|S_{j_n} t_n - t_n\|^2 \\ &= \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \frac{1 - \beta - \beta_n^{j_n}}{\beta_n^{j_n}} \|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

in which the last equality is followed from the relation (10). From the assumption of $\beta_n^{j_n}$, we see that $\frac{1 - \beta - \beta_n^{j_n}}{\beta_n^{j_n}} \geq 1$. Thus, it follows from the last inequality that

$$\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2. \quad (11)$$

From the definition of t_n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2 &= \|\bar{z}_n - \alpha_n F(\bar{z}_n) - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{n+1} - (\bar{z}_n - \alpha_n F(\bar{z}_n))\|^2 \\ &= \|\bar{z}_n - x^*\|^2 - 2\alpha_n \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(\bar{z}_n) \rangle - \|x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_1) \|\bar{y}_n - x_n\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_2) \|\bar{y}_n - \bar{z}_n\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\alpha_n \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(\bar{z}_n) \rangle - \|x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

in which the last inequality is followed from the relation (9). The last inequality and the relation (11) lead to the desired conclusion.

Lemma 3.7 *The sequences $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n^i\}$, $\{z_n^i\}$, $\{u_n^j\}$, $\{t_n\}$ are bounded for all $i \in I$ and $j \in J$.*

Proof For a fixed $\mu \in (0, \frac{2\eta}{L^2})$. Since $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$, we can assume that $\{\alpha_n\} \subset (0, \mu)$. From the definitions of G^μ in Lemma 2.2 and of t_n in Algorithm 3.1, we have $t_n = G^{\alpha_n}(\bar{z}_n)$. Using Lemma 2.2(ii) for $y = \bar{z}_n$, $x = x^*$ and $v = \alpha_n$, we obtain

$$\|t_n - x^*\| = \|G^{\alpha_n}(\bar{z}_n) - x^*\| \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_n \tau}{\mu}\right) \|\bar{z}_n - x^*\| + \alpha_n \|F(x^*)\|, \quad (12)$$

where τ is defined as in Lemma 2.2. From the relation (9) and the hypotheses of ρ , we obtain

$$\|\bar{z}_n - x^*\| \leq \|x_n - x^*\|. \quad (13)$$

From the relation (11) with $n := n - 1$, we have

$$\|x_n - x^*\|^2 \leq \|t_{n-1} - x^*\|^2 - \|x_n - t_{n-1}\|^2$$

which implies

$$\|x_n - x^*\| \leq \|t_{n-1} - x^*\|. \quad (14)$$

Thus, it follows from the relation (13) that

$$\|\bar{z}_n - x^*\| \leq \|t_{n-1} - x^*\|.$$

This together with (12) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|t_n - x^*\| &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_n \tau}{\mu}\right) \|t_{n-1} - x^*\| + \alpha_n \|F(x^*)\| \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_n \tau}{\mu}\right) \|t_{n-1} - x^*\| + \frac{\alpha_n \tau}{\mu} \left(\frac{\mu}{\tau} \|F(x^*)\|\right) \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \|t_{n-1} - x^*\|, \frac{\mu}{\tau} \|F(x^*)\| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\|t_n - x^*\| \leq \max \left\{ \|t_0 - x^*\|, \frac{\mu}{\tau} \|F(x^*)\| \right\}, \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

This implies the boundedness of $\{t_n\}$. Hence, from (13) and (14), we see that the sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{\bar{z}_n\}$ are bounded. It follows from the definitions of $\bar{z}_n$ and x_{n+1} that

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_n^i - x_n\| &\leq \|\bar{z}_n - x_n\|, \quad \forall i \in I, \\ \|u_n^j - t_n\| &\leq \|x_{n+1} - t_n\|, \quad \forall j \in J. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the sequences $\{z_n^i\}$, $\{u_n^j\}$ are also bounded. Finally, the boundedness of $\{y_n^i\}$ is followed from Lemma 3.4(ii), the hypothesis of ρ and the boundedness of the sequences $\{z_n^i\}$, $\{x_n\}$.

Theorem 3.1 Assume that Conditions 1, 2, 3 hold and the operator $F : C \rightarrow H$ is η - strongly monotone and L - Lipschitz continuous. In addition, the set Ω is nonempty. Then, the sequence $\{x_n\}$ generated by Algorithm 3.1 converges strongly to the unique solution x^* of VIP for F on Ω .

Proof Since $\{x_n\}, \{\bar{z}_n\}$ are bounded and F is L - Lipschitz continuous, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$2|\langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(\bar{z}_n) \rangle| \leq K. \quad (15)$$

Set $\varepsilon_n = \|x_n - x^*\|^2$. Using Lemma 3.6 and the relation (15), we obtain

$$\varepsilon_{n+1} - \varepsilon_n + (1 - 2\rho c_1)\|\bar{y}_n - x_n\|^2 + (1 - 2\rho c_2)\|\bar{y}_n - \bar{z}_n\|^2 + \|x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n\|^2 \leq \alpha_n K. \quad (16)$$

We consider two cases.

Case 1. There exists n_0 such that $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ is decreasing for all $n \geq n_0$. Thus, from $\varepsilon_n \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$, there exists the limit of $\{\varepsilon_n\}$, i.e., $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow \varepsilon \geq 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, it follows from (16), the hypothesis of ρ and $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ that

$$\|\bar{y}_n - x_n\| \rightarrow 0, \|\bar{y}_n - \bar{z}_n\| \rightarrow 0, \|x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n\| \rightarrow 0. \quad (17)$$

From the relation (17) and the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\|x_{n+1} - x_n\| \rightarrow 0, \|\bar{z}_n - x_n\| \rightarrow 0. \quad (18)$$

From the definition of $\bar{z}_n$, we obtain $\|z_n^i - x_n\| \leq \|\bar{z}_n - x_n\|$, $\forall i \in I$. This together with (18) implies that

$$\|z_n^i - x_n\| \rightarrow 0, \forall i \in I. \quad (19)$$

From Lemma 3.4(ii) and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - 2\rho c_1)\|\bar{y}_n^i - x_n\|^2 + (1 - 2\rho c_2)\|\bar{y}_n^i - z_n^i\|^2 &\leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - \|z_n^i - x^*\|^2 \\ &\leq (\|x_n - x^*\| - \|z_n^i - x^*\|)(\|x_n - x^*\| + \|z_n^i - x^*\|) \\ &\leq \|x_n - z_n^i\|(\|x_n - x^*\| + \|z_n^i - x^*\|). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit in the last inequality and using the hypothesis of ρ , the boundedness of $\{x_n\}, \{z_n^i\}$ and (19), we obtain

$$\|\bar{y}_n^i - x_n\| \rightarrow 0, \|\bar{y}_n^i - z_n^i\| \rightarrow 0, \forall i \in I. \quad (20)$$

Since $\{\bar{z}_n\}$ is bounded, without loss of generality, we can assume that there exists a subsequence $\{\bar{z}_m\}$ of $\{\bar{z}_n\}$ converging weakly to p such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{z}_n - x^*, Fx^* \rangle = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{z}_m - x^*, Fx^* \rangle. \quad (21)$$

Now, we prove that $p \in \Omega$. Indeed, it follows from Lemma 3.5 that, for all $y \in C$,

$$\rho f_i(y_m^i, y) \geq \langle y_m^i - x_m, y_m^i - z_m^i \rangle - c_1 \rho \|y_m^i - x_m\|^2 - c_2 \rho \|z_m^i - y_m^i\|^2 + \langle z_m^i - x_m, z_m^i - y \rangle.$$

From $\bar{z}_n \rightharpoonup p$ and the relations (18) and (20), we obtain $x_n \rightharpoonup p$, $y_n^i \rightharpoonup p$, $z_n^i \rightharpoonup p$. Thus, letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ in the last inequality and using hypothesis A3, $\rho > 0$ and (20), we obtain

$$0 \leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_i(y_n, y) \leq f_i(p, y), \forall y \in C, \forall i \in I.$$

Thus, $p \in \cap_{i \in I} EP(f_i, C)$. Moreover, since $u_m^j = (1 - \beta_m^j)t_m + \beta_m^j S_j t_m$ and $\beta_m^j \geq a > 0$,

$$\|t_m - S_j t_m\| = \frac{1}{\beta_m^j} \|u_m^j - t_m\| \leq \frac{1}{a} \|u_m^j - t_m\| \leq \frac{1}{a} \|x_{m+1} - t_m\|, \quad (22)$$

in which the last inequality is followed from the definition of x_{m+1} . From the definition of t_m , $\alpha_m \rightarrow 0$ and the boundedness of $\{\bar{z}_m\}$, we obtain

$$\|t_m - \bar{z}_m\| = \alpha_m \|F(\bar{z}_m)\| \rightarrow 0. \quad (23)$$

This together with (17) implies that $\|x_{m+1} - t_m\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus, it follows from (22) that $\|t_m - S_j t_m\| \rightarrow 0$ and $t_m \rightarrow p$. Since S_j is demiclosed at zero, $p \in \cap_{j \in J} \text{Fix}(S_j)$. Hence, $p \in \Omega$.

In order to finish Case 1, we show that

$$\varepsilon_n = \|x_n - x^*\|^2 \rightarrow \varepsilon = 0.$$

Since $\|x_n - \bar{z}_n\| \rightarrow 0$, $\|\bar{z}_n - x^*\|^2 \rightarrow \varepsilon$. From (21), $\bar{z}_n \rightarrow p \in \Omega$ and $x^* \in \text{VIP}(F, \Omega)$, one has

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{z}_n - x^*, Fx^* \rangle = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{z}_m - x^*, Fx^* \rangle = \langle p - x^*, Fx^* \rangle \geq 0. \quad (24)$$

From the η - strongly monotonicity of F ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F\bar{z}_n \rangle &= \langle x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n, F\bar{z}_n \rangle + \langle \bar{z}_n - x^*, F\bar{z}_n \rangle \\ &= \langle x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n, F\bar{z}_n \rangle + \langle \bar{z}_n - x^*, F\bar{z}_n - Fx^* \rangle + \langle \bar{z}_n - x^*, Fx^* \rangle \\ &\geq \langle x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n, F\bar{z}_n \rangle + \eta \|\bar{z}_n - x^*\|^2 + \langle \bar{z}_n - x^*, Fx^* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This together with $\|x_{n+1} - \bar{z}_n\| \rightarrow 0$, $\|\bar{z}_n - x^*\|^2 \rightarrow \varepsilon$ and (24) implies that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F\bar{z}_n \rangle \geq \eta \varepsilon. \quad (25)$$

Assume that $\varepsilon > 0$, then there exists a positive integer n_0 such that

$$\langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F\bar{z}_n \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2} \eta \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq n_0. \quad (26)$$

It follows from Lemma 3.6 that

$$\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - 2\alpha_n \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(\bar{z}_n) \rangle. \quad (27)$$

Combining (26) and (27), we obtain

$$\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 - \|x_n - x^*\|^2 \leq -\alpha_n \eta \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq n_0,$$

or

$$\varepsilon_{n+1} - \varepsilon_n \leq -\alpha_n \eta \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq n_0.$$

Thus,

$$\varepsilon_{n+1} - \varepsilon_{n_0} \leq -\eta \varepsilon \sum_{k=n_0}^{n+1} \alpha_k. \quad (28)$$

Since $\eta > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n = +\infty$, it follows from (28) that $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow -\infty$. This is contradiction. Therefore $\varepsilon = 0$ or $x_n \rightarrow x^*$.

Case 2. There exists a subsequence $\{\varepsilon_{n_i}\}$ of $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ such that $\varepsilon_{n_i} \leq \varepsilon_{n_i+1}$ for all $i \geq 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that

$$\varepsilon_{\tau(n)} \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1}, \quad \varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1}, \quad \forall n \geq n_0. \quad (29)$$

where $\tau(n) = \max \{k \in N : n_0 \leq k \leq n, \varepsilon_k \leq \varepsilon_{k+1}\}$. Furthermore, the sequence $\{\tau(n)\}_{n \geq n_0}$ is non-decreasing and $\tau(n) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It follows from (16), the hypotheses of ρ , $\varepsilon_{\tau(n)} \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1}$ and $\alpha_{\tau(n)} \rightarrow 0$ that

$$\|\bar{y}_{\tau(n)} - x_{\tau(n)}\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|\bar{y}_{\tau(n)} - \bar{z}_{\tau(n)}\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|x_{\tau(n)+1} - \bar{z}_{\tau(n)}\| \rightarrow 0. \quad (30)$$

These together with the triangle inequality imply that $\|x_{\tau(n)} - \bar{z}_{\tau(n)}\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus, from the definition of the index $i_{\tau(n)}$, we have

$$\|x_{\tau(n)} - z_{\tau(n)}^i\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall i \in I. \quad (31)$$

From Lemma 3.4(ii) and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} (1-2\rho c_1)\|y_{\tau(n)}^i - x_{\tau(n)}\|^2 + (1-2\rho c_2)\|y_{\tau(n)}^i - z_{\tau(n)}^i\|^2 &\leq \|x_{\tau(n)} - x^*\|^2 - \|z_{\tau(n)}^i - x^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(\|x_{\tau(n)} - x^*\| - \|z_{\tau(n)}^i - x^*\|\right) \left(\|x_{\tau(n)} - x^*\| + \|z_{\tau(n)}^i - x^*\|\right) \\ &\leq \|x_{\tau(n)} - z_{\tau(n)}^i\| \left(\|x_{\tau(n)} - x^*\| + \|z_{\tau(n)}^i - x^*\|\right). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit in the last inequality and using the hypothesis of ρ , the boundedness of $\{x_{\tau(n)}\}$, $\{z_{\tau(n)}^i\}$ and (31), we obtain

$$\|y_{\tau(n)}^i - x_{\tau(n)}\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \|y_{\tau(n)}^i - z_{\tau(n)}^i\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall i \in I. \quad (32)$$

Since $\{\bar{z}_{\tau(n)}\}$ is bounded, there exists a subsequence $\{\bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)}\}$ of $\{\bar{z}_{\tau(n)}\}$ converging weakly to p such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*, F(x^*) \rangle = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)} - x^*, F(x^*) \rangle \quad (33)$$

From (30), (32) and $\bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)} \rightharpoonup p$, we also have $x_{\tau(n_k)} \rightharpoonup p$, $y_{\tau(n_k)}^i \rightharpoonup p$, $z_{\tau(n_k)}^i \rightharpoonup p$. Now, we show that $p \in \Omega$. Indeed, it follows from Lemma 3.5 that, for all $y \in C$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho f_i(y_{\tau(n_k)}^i, y) &\geq \langle y_{\tau(n_k)}^i - x_{\tau(n_k)}, y_{\tau(n_k)}^i - z_{\tau(n_k)}^i \rangle - c_1 \rho \|y_{\tau(n_k)}^i - x_{\tau(n_k)}\|^2 \\ &\quad - c_2 \rho \|z_{\tau(n_k)}^i - y_{\tau(n_k)}^i\|^2 + \langle z_{\tau(n_k)}^i - x_{\tau(n_k)}, z_{\tau(n_k)}^i - y \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit in the last inequality as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using (31), (32), $\rho > 0$ and A3, we obtain

$$0 \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_i(y_{\tau(n_k)}^i, y) \leq f_i(p, y), \quad \forall y \in C, \quad \forall i \in I.$$

Thus, $p \in \cap_{i \in I} EP(f_i, C)$. From $u_{\tau(n_k)}^j = (1 - \beta_{\tau(n_k)}^j)t_{\tau(n_k)} + \beta_{\tau(n_k)}^j S_j t_{\tau(n_k)}$ and $\beta_{\tau(n_k)}^j \geq a > 0$, we see that

$$\|t_{\tau(n_k)} - S_j t_{\tau(n_k)}\| = \frac{1}{\beta_{\tau(n_k)}^j} \|u_{\tau(n_k)}^j - t_{\tau(n_k)}\| \leq \frac{1}{a} \|u_{\tau(n_k)}^j - t_{\tau(n_k)}\| \leq \frac{1}{a} \|x_{\tau(n_k)+1} - t_{\tau(n_k)}\|, \quad (34)$$

in which the last inequality is followed from the definition of $x_{\tau(n_k)+1}$. It follows from the definition of $t_{\tau(n_k)}$, $\alpha_{\tau(n_k)} \rightarrow 0$ and the boundedness of $\{\bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)}\}$ that

$$\|t_{\tau(n_k)} - \bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)}\| = \alpha_{\tau(n_k)} \|F(\bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)})\| \rightarrow 0. \quad (35)$$

This together with (30) implies that $\|x_{\tau(n_k)+1} - t_{\tau(n_k)}\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus, from (34) and $x_{\tau(n_k)+1} \rightharpoonup p$, we obtain $\|t_{\tau(n_k)} - S_j t_{\tau(n_k)}\| \rightarrow 0$ and $t_{\tau(n_k)} \rightharpoonup p$. Since S_j is demiclosed at zero, $p \in \bigcap_{j \in J} \text{Fix}(S_j)$. Hence, $p \in \Omega$.

Now, we prove that $x_{\tau(n_k)} \rightarrow x^*$. It follows from Lemma 3.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\alpha_{\tau(n)} \langle x_{\tau(n)+1} - x^*, F(\bar{z}_{\tau(n)}) \rangle &\leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)} - \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1} - (1 - 2\rho c_1) \|\bar{y}_{\tau(n)} - x_{\tau(n)}\|^2 \\ &\quad - (1 - 2\rho c_2) \|\bar{y}_{\tau(n)} - \bar{z}_{\tau(n)}\|^2 - \|x_{\tau(n)+1} - \bar{z}_{\tau(n)}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\langle x_{\tau(n)+1} - x^*, F(\bar{z}_{\tau(n)}) \rangle \leq 0 \quad (36)$$

because of $\alpha_{\tau(n)} > 0$, $\varepsilon_{\tau(n)} \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1}$ and the hypothesis of ρ . From the η - strong monotonicity and the relation (36),

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \|\bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*, F\bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - Fx^* \rangle \\ &= \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*, F\bar{z}_{\tau(n)} \rangle - \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*, Fx^* \rangle \\ &= \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x_{\tau(n)+1}, F\bar{z}_{\tau(n)} \rangle + \langle x_{\tau(n)+1} - x^*, F\bar{z}_{\tau(n)} \rangle - \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)} - x^*, Fx^* \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x_{\tau(n)+1}, F\bar{z}_{\tau(n)} \rangle - \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*, Fx^* \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (30), (33) and $\bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)} \rightharpoonup p$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta \|\bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*\|^2 &\leq -\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*, Fx^* \rangle \\ &= -\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{z}_{\tau(n_k)} - x^*, Fx^* \rangle \\ &= -\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle p - x^*, Fx^* \rangle \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

in which the last inequality is followed from $p \in \Omega$ and $x^* \in \text{VIP}(F, \Omega)$. Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{z}_{\tau(n)} - x^*\|^2 = 0$$

because of $\eta > 0$. This together with (30) implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|x_{\tau(n_k)+1} - x^*\|^2 = 0$. Thus, $\varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1} \rightarrow 0$. It follows from (29) that $0 \leq \varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1} \rightarrow 0$. Hence, $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ or $x_n \rightarrow x^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Theorem 3.1 is proved.

Next, by replacing the element $\bar{z}_n$ in Step 3 and the next one x_{n+1} in Step 4 of Algorithm 3.1 by convex combinations of z_n^i , $i \in I$ and of u_n^j , $j \in I$, respectively, we come to the following algorithm.

Algorithm 3.2 Initialization. Choose $x_0 \in C$. The parameters ρ , α_n , β_n^j , w_n^i , γ_n^j satisfy Condition 4 below.

Step 1. Find simultaneously approximations y_n^i , $i \in I$

$$y_n^i = \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \rho f_i(x_n, y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x_n - y\|^2 : y \in C \right\}.$$

Step 2. Find simultaneously approximations $z_n^i, i \in I$

$$z_n^i = \operatorname{argmin}\{\rho f_i(y_n^i, y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x_n - y\|^2 : y \in C\}.$$

Step 3. Compute

$$z_n = \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i z_n^i,$$

$$x_{n+1} = \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j [(1 - \beta_n^j) t_n + \beta_n^j S_j t_n],$$

where $t_n = z_n - \alpha_n F(z_n)$. Set $n = n + 1$ and go back **Step 1**.

From Step 3 of Algorithm 3.2, we see that the problems of computing z_n and x_{n+1} are more simpler than those of computing $\bar{z}_n$ and x_{n+1} in Steps 3, 4 of Algorithm 3.1. This is also illustrated in our numerical experiments in Sec. 4 where time for execution of this algorithm is less consuming than Algorithm 3.1 and the parallel hybrid extragradient method in [10]. In order to obtain the convergence of Algorithm 3.2, we install the following condition on the control parameters in Algorithm 3.2.

Condition 4 Condition 3 holds and

- (iv) $w_n^i \in (0, 1)$, $\sum_{i \in I} w_n^i = 1$, $\liminf_n w_n^i > 0$ for all $i \in I$ and $n \geq 0$.
- (v) $\gamma_n^j \in (0, 1)$, $\sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j = 1$, $\liminf_n \gamma_n^j > 0$ for all $j \in J$ and $n \geq 0$.

Theorem 3.2 The conclusion of Theorem 3.1 remains true for Algorithm 3.2 under Conditions 1, 2 and 4.

Proof We divide the proof of Theorem 3.2 into several steps.

Claim 1. Suppose that $x^* \in VIP(F, \Omega)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_1) \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_2) \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|y_n^i - z_n^i\|^2 \\ &\quad - \|x_{n+1} - z_n\|^2 - 2\alpha_n \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(z_n) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Claim 1. From the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$ and Lemma 3.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_n - x^*\|^2 &= \sum_{i \in I} \|w_n^i (z_n^i - x^*)\|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|z_n^i - x^*\|^2 \leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 \\ &\quad - (1 - 2\rho c_1) \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_2) \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|y_n^i - \bar{z}_n\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Setting $u_n^j := S_{j, \beta_n^j} t_n = (1 - \beta_n^j) t_n + \beta_n^j S_j t_n$. From the definitions of x_{n+1} and u_n^j , we have $x_{n+1} = \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j u_n^j$ and $\|u_n^j - t_n\|^2 = (\beta_n^j)^2 \|t_n - S_j t_n\|^2$. Thus, by the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$,

$$\|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j (u_n^j - t_n) \right\|^2 \leq \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j \|u_n^j - t_n\|^2 = \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j (\beta_n^j)^2 \|t_n - S_j t_n\|^2. \quad (38)$$

From the hypothesis of β_n^j ,

$$\frac{1 - \beta - \beta_n^j}{\beta_n^j} \geq 1. \quad (39)$$

By the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$, Lemma 2.1(i), $\sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j = 1$ and the relations (38), (39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 &= \left\| \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j (u_n^j - x^*) \right\|^2 \leq \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j \|u_n^j - x^*\|^2 = \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j \|S_j t_n - x^*\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_n^j [\|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \beta_n^j (1 - \beta - \beta_n^j) \|S_j t_n - t_n\|^2] \\
&= \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \sum_{j \in J} \beta_n^j (1 - \beta - \beta_n^j) \gamma_n^j \|S_j t_n - t_n\|^2 \\
&= \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1 - \beta - \beta_n^j}{\beta_n^j} (\beta_n^j)^2 \gamma_n^j \|S_j t_n - t_n\|^2 \\
&\leq \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \sum_{j \in J} (\beta_n^j)^2 \gamma_n^j \|S_j t_n - t_n\|^2 \\
&\leq \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Thus

$$\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 \leq \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2 \leq \|t_n - x^*\|^2. \tag{41}$$

This together with (37), the definition of t_n implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|x_{n+1} - x^*\|^2 &\leq \|t_n - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{n+1} - t_n\|^2 \\
&= \|z_n - \alpha_n F(z_n) - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{n+1} - (z_n - \alpha_n F(z_n))\|^2 \\
&= \|z_n - x^*\|^2 - 2\alpha_n \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(z_n) \rangle - \|x_{n+1} - z_n\|^2 \\
&\leq \|x_n - x^*\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_1) \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 - (1 - 2\rho c_2) \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|y_n^i - z_n^i\|^2 \\
&\quad - 2\alpha_n \langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(z_n) \rangle - \|x_{n+1} - z_n\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

Claim 2. The sequences $\{x_n\}$, $\{y_n^i\}$, $\{z_n^i\}$, $\{t_n\}$ are bounded for all $i \in I$ and $j \in J$.

The proof of Claim 2. Repeating the proof of Lemma 3.7, we can conclude that $\{t_n\}$ is a bounded sequence. It follows from (41) that $\{x_n\}$ is bounded. The boundedness of $\{y_n^i\}$, $\{z_n^i\}$ is followed from Lemma 3.4(ii).

Claim 3. If $\{x_m\}$ is some subsequence of $\{x_n\}$ such that $\|x_{m+1} - t_m\| \rightarrow 0$ then $\|S_j t_m - t_m\| \rightarrow 0$ for all $j \in J$.

The proof of Claim 3. From $\beta_m^j \geq a > 0$, the relation (40) and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
a^2 \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_m^j \|S_j t_m - t_m\|^2 &\leq \sum_{j \in J} (\beta_m^j)^2 \gamma_m^j \|S_j t_m - t_m\|^2 \\
&\leq \|t_m - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{m+1} - x^*\|^2 \\
&= (\|t_m - x^*\| - \|x_{m+1} - x^*\|)(\|t_m - x^*\| + \|x_{m+1} - x^*\|) \\
&\leq \|t_m - x_{m+1}\|(\|t_m - x^*\| + \|x_{m+1} - x^*\|)
\end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit in the last inequality as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and using the hypothesis $\|t_m - x_{m+1}\| \rightarrow 0$, the boundedness of $\{x_m\}$, $\{t_m\}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{j \in J} \gamma_m^j \|S_j t_m - t_m\|^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

This together with the hypothesis $\liminf_n \gamma_n^j > 0$ yields the desired conclusion.

Claim 4. $x_n \rightarrow x^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where x^* is the unique solution of VIP (5).

The proof of Claim 4. Since $\{x_n\}, \{z_n\}$ are bounded and F is L - Lipschitz continuous, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$2|\langle x_{n+1} - x^*, F(z_n) \rangle| \leq K. \quad (42)$$

Set $\varepsilon_n = \|x_n - x^*\|^2$. Using Lemma 3.6, we obtain

$$\varepsilon_{n+1} - \varepsilon_n + (1 - 2\rho c_1) \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|y_n^i - x_n\|^2 + (1 - 2\rho c_2) \sum_{i \in I} w_n^i \|y_n^i - z_n^i\|^2 + \|x_{n+1} - z_n\|^2 \leq \alpha_n K. \quad (43)$$

We consider two cases.

Case 1. There exists n_0 such that $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ is decreasing for all $n \geq n_0$. Since $\varepsilon_n \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$, there exists the limit of $\{\varepsilon_n\}$, i.e., $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow \varepsilon$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, it follows from (43), the facts $1 - 2\rho c_1 > 0$, $1 - 2\rho c_2 > 0$, $\liminf_n w_n^i > 0$ and $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ that

$$\|y_n^i - x_n\| \rightarrow 0, \|y_n^i - z_n^i\| \rightarrow 0, \|x_{n+1} - z_n\| \rightarrow 0, \forall i \in I. \quad (44)$$

Using (44) and repeating the proof of Case 1 in Theorem 3.1, we obtain $x_n \rightarrow x^*$.

Case 2. There exists a subsequence $\{\varepsilon_{n_i}\}$ of $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ such that $\varepsilon_{n_i} \leq \varepsilon_{n_i+1}$ for all $i \geq 0$. It follows from Lemma 2.3 that

$$\varepsilon_{\tau(n)} \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1}, \varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1}, \forall n \geq n_0. \quad (45)$$

where $\tau(n) = \max\{k \in N : n_0 \leq k \leq n, \varepsilon_k \leq \varepsilon_{k+1}\}$. Furthermore, the sequence $\{\tau(n)\}_{n \geq n_0}$ is non-decreasing and $\tau(n) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It follows from (43), the hypotheses of ρ , $\liminf_n w_n^i > 0$, $\varepsilon_{\tau(n)} \leq \varepsilon_{\tau(n)+1}$ and $\alpha_{\tau(n)} \rightarrow 0$ that

$$\|y_{\tau(n)}^i - x_{\tau(n)}\| \rightarrow 0, \|y_{\tau(n)}^i - z_{\tau(n)}^i\| \rightarrow 0, \|x_{\tau(n)+1} - z_{\tau(n)}\| \rightarrow 0, \forall i \in I. \quad (46)$$

Using (46) and repeating the proof of Case 2 in Theorem 3.1, we obtain $x_n \rightarrow x^*$. Theorem 3.2 is proved.

4 A numerical example

In this section, we perform a numerical example to illustrate the convergence of Algorithms 3.1, 3.2 and compare them with the parallel hybrid extragradient method (PHEM), see [10, Algorithm 1]. All programs are written in Matlab 7.0 and computed on a PC Desktop Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-3210M CPU @ 2.50GHz 2.50 GHz, RAM 2.00 GB.

We consider the bifunctions f_i which are generalized from the Nash-Cournot equilibrium model in [9, 23] defined by

$$f_i(x, y) = \langle P_i x + Q_i y + q_i, y - x \rangle, i \in I = \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}, \quad (47)$$

where $q_i \in \mathfrak{R}^m$ ($m = 10$) and P_i, Q_i are matrices of order m such that Q_i is symmetric, positive semidefinite and $Q_i - P_i$ is negative semidefinite. The feasible set $C \in \mathfrak{R}^m$ is a polyhedral convex set as

$$C = \{x \in \mathfrak{R}^m : Ax \leq b\},$$

where $A \in \mathfrak{R}^{m \times k}$ is a matrix and b is a positive vector in $\mathfrak{R}^k$ ($k = 20$). Let $T_j, j \in J = \{1, 2, \dots, 20\}$ be half-spaces defined by $T_j = \{x \in \mathfrak{R}^m : \langle x, h_j \rangle \leq l_j\}$, where $h_j \in \mathfrak{R}^m$ and l_j are positive real numbers. Define the mappings $S_j : C \rightarrow C$ defined by $S_j = P_C P_{T_j}$. The operator $F(x) = x - a$ where $a = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathfrak{R}^m$. The bifunctions f_i satisfy Condition 1 with

$c_1^i = c_2^i = \|P_i - Q_i\|/2$, see Lemma 6.2 in [23]. We here chose $c_1 = c_2 = \max\{c_1^i : i \in I\}$. Since the mappings S_j are nonexpansive, they are β - demicontractive with $\beta = 0$. In the mentioned algorithms, we need to solve the following optimization program

$$\arg \min \left\{ \rho f_i(x_n, y) + \frac{1}{2} \|x_n - y\|^2 : y \in C \right\}$$

or the convex quadratic problem

$$\arg \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} y^T H_i y + b_i^T y : y \in C \right\} \quad (48)$$

where $H_i = 2\rho Q_i + I$ and $b_i = \rho(P_i x_n - Q_i x_n + q_i) - x_n$ to obtain the approximation y_n^i . Similarly, z_n^i solves the following program

$$\arg \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} y^T \widehat{H}_i y + \widehat{b}_i^T y : y \in C \right\} \quad (49)$$

where $\widehat{H}_i = H_i$ and $\widehat{b}_i = \rho(P_i y_n^i - Q_i y_n^i + q_i) - x_n$. Problems (48), (49) can be effectively solved, for instance, by the MATLAB Optimization Toolbox. All projections onto half-spaces are explicit and onto polyhedral convex sets of Algorithm 1 in [10] are rewritten equivalently to convex quadratic problems.

In below experiments, all entries of A , h_j are randomly generated in $[-m, m]$ and of b , l_j in $[1, m]$, the vectors q_i are the zero vector. All entries of P_i , Q_i are also generated randomly¹ such that they satisfy the mentioned conditions above. It is easy to see that $0 \in \cap_{i \in I} EP(f_i, C)$ and $\cap_{j \in J} \text{Fix}(S_j) = C \cap (\cap_{j \in J} H_j)$. With choosing b and l_j above, then $0 \in \cap_{j \in J} \text{Fix}(S_j)$, thus $0 \in \Omega$. To check whether $\{x_n\}$ converges to $x^* = 0$ or not, we use the function $D_n = \|x_n - x^*\|$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The convergence of $\{D_n\}$ to 0 implies that $\{x_n\}$ converges to the solution of Problem 1. We chose the starting point $x_0 = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\rho = \frac{1}{4c_1}$, $w_n^i = \frac{1}{N}$, $\gamma_n^j = \frac{1}{M}$, $\beta_n^j = \frac{1}{4}$ for all i, j, n . We perform two experiments for all algorithms with $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{(n+1)^{0.5}}$ or $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{n+1}$. Figures 1 and 2 describe the behavior of D_n with $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{(n+1)^{0.5}}$ and $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{n+1}$, resp., for 1000 first iterations. From these figures, we see that the convergence of Algorithm 3.1 is the best in both two cases. In the case $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{n+1}$, the convergence rate of Algorithm 3.1 is better than the case $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{(n+1)^{0.5}}$ and the obtained tolerance is $D_n < 10^{-5}$ after 1000 first iterations. The times for execution of Algorithm 3.1 are smaller those of PHEM in two cases. The reason for this is that in Algorithm 3.1, we do not need to construct two sets C_n and Q_n and find the projection onto their intersection. For Algorithm 3.2, although the convergence rate is the slowest, but the times for execution is the smallest. This is obvious because in Algorithm 3.2 we have not to find the furthest approximations and construct two set C_n and Q_n per each iteration. This algorithm is the simplest in computing.

¹ We randomly chose $\lambda_{1k}^i \in [-m, 0]$, $\lambda_{2k}^i \in [0, m]$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. Set $\widehat{Q}_1^i, \widehat{Q}_2^i$ as two diagonal matrixes with eigenvalues $\{\lambda_{1k}^i\}_{k=1}^m$ and $\{\lambda_{2k}^i\}_{k=1}^m$, respectively. Then, we make a positive semidefinite matrix Q_i and a negative semidefinite matrix T_i by using random orthogonal matrixes with $\widehat{Q}_2^i$ and $\widehat{Q}_1^i$, respectively. Finally, set $P_i = Q_i - T_i$




Fig. 1 Behavior of $D_n = \|x_n - x^*\|$ for Algorithms 3.1, 3.2 and PHEM with $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{n+1}$ (The execution times 1000 first iterations are 58.29s, 49.78s and 80.23s, resp.)




Fig. 2 Behavior of $D_n = \|x_n - x^*\|$ for Algorithms 3.1, 3.2 and PHEM with $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{(n+1)^{0.5}}$ (The execution times for 1000 first iterations are 60.34s, 51.32s and 84.43s, resp.)

5 Concluding

In this paper, we have proposed two parallel extragradient - viscosity methods for finding a particular common solution of a finite family of equilibrium problems for pseudomonotone and Lipschitz-type continuous bifunctions and a finite family of fixed point problems for demicontractive mappings. The considered particular element is the unique solution of a variational inequality problem on the common solution set of two families. The proposed algorithms can be considered as improvements of some previously known hybrid methods

in computations. A numerical example is performed to illustrate the convergence of the algorithms and compare them with the parallel hybrid extragradient method.

References

1. Anh, P. N.: A hybrid extragradient method extended to fixed point problems and equilibrium problems. *Optimization*. **62**(2), 271–283 (2013)
2. Anh, P. K., Buong, Ng., Hieu, D. V.: Parallel methods for regularizing systems of equations involving accretive operators. *Applicable Analysis: An International Journal*. **93**(10), 2136–2157 (2014)
3. Anh, P.K., Hieu, D.V.: Parallel and sequential hybrid methods for a finite family of asymptotically quasi ϕ -nonexpansive mappings. *J. Appl. Math. Comput.* **48**, 241–263 (2015)
4. Anh, P.K., Hieu, D.V.: Parallel hybrid methods for variational inequalities, equilibrium problems and common fixed point problems. *Vietnam J. Math.* (2015), DOI:10.1007/s10013-015-0129-z
5. Blum, E., Oettli, W.: From optimization and variational inequalities to equilibrium problems, *Math. Program.* **63**, 123–145 (1994)
6. Combettes, P. L., Hirstoaga, S. A.: Equilibrium programming in Hilbert spaces. *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.* **6**, 117–136 (2005)
7. Censor, Y., Gibali, A., Reich, S.: Algorithms for the split variational inequality problem. *Numer. Algorithms*. **59**(2) (2012), 301–323.
8. Censor, Y., Gibali, A., Reich, S., Sabach, S.: Common Solutions to Variational Inequalities. *Set-Valued Var. Anal.* **20**, 229–247 (2012)
9. Facchinei, F., Pang, J.S.: *Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems*. Springer, Berlin (2002)
10. Hieu, D. V., Muu, L. D., Anh, P. K.: Parallel hybrid extragradient methods for pseudomonotone equilibrium problems and nonexpansive mappings. *Numer. Algorithms*. DOI: 10.1007/s11075-015-0092-5
11. Hieu, D. V.: A parallel hybrid method for equilibrium problems, variational inequalities and nonexpansive mappings in Hilbert space. *J. Korean Math. Soc.* **52**, 373–388 (2015)
12. Hieu, D. V.: Parallel hybrid methods for generalized equilibrium problems and asymptotically strictly pseudocontractive mappings. *J. Appl. Math. Comput.* (2016). DOI :10.1007/s12190-015-0980-9.
13. Hieu, D. V.: Parallel extragradient-proximal methods for split equilibrium problems. *Math. Model. Anal.* (Revised) (2016).
14. Hieu, D. V.: The common solutions to pseudomonotone equilibrium problems. *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.* (accepted for publication) (2015)
15. Hieu, D. V.: An extension of hybrid method without extrapolation step to equilibrium problems. *Journal of Industrial and Management Optimization* (Revised).
16. Konnov, I.V.: *Combined Relaxation Methods for Variational Inequalities*. Springer, Berlin (2000)
17. Kinderlehrer, D., Stampacchia, G.: *An Introduction to Variational Inequalities and Their Applications*. Academic Press, New York (1980)
18. Korpelevich, G. M.: The extragradient method for finding saddle points and other problems, *Ekonomikai Matematicheskie Metody*. **12**, 747–756 (1976)
19. Mastroeni, G.: On auxiliary principle for equilibrium problems, in: *Equilibrium Problems and Variational Models*, P. Daniele et al. (eds), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 289–298 (2003)
20. Maingé, P. E.: A hybrid extragradient-viscosity method for monotone operators and fixed point problems, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **47** (2008), pp. 1499–1515.
21. Maingé, P.E., Moudafi A.: Coupling viscosity methods with the extragradient algorithm for solving equilibrium problems. *J. Nonlinear Convex Anal.* 2008;9:283–294.
22. Moudafi, A. On the convergence of splitting proximal methods for equilibrium problems in Hilbert spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 2009; 359: 508–513.
23. Quoc, T.D., Muu, L.D., Hien, N.V.: Extragradient algorithms extended to equilibrium problems. *Optimization* **57**, 749–776 (2008)
24. Rockafellar, R.T.: Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **14**, 877–898 (1976)
25. Vuong, P.T., Strodiot, J.J., Nguyen, V.H.: On extragradient-viscosity methods for solving equilibrium and fixed point problems in a Hilbert space. *Optimization* (2013) DOI: 10.1080/02331934.2012.759327.
26. Yamada, I.: The hybrid steepest descent method for the variational inequality problem over the intersection of fixed point sets of nonexpansive mappings, In: Butnariu, D., Censor, Y., Reich, S. (eds.) *Inherently Parallel Algorithms for Feasibility and Optimization and Their Applications*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, (2001), pp. 473–504.

